



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,615	11/13/2003	Peter Battagline	D0047A CIP	6370
23914	7590	08/11/2005	EXAMINER	
STEPHEN B. DAVIS BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY PATENT DEPARTMENT P O BOX 4000 PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000			LI, RUIXIANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	
DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/712,615

Applicant(s)

BATTAGLINO ET AL.

Examiner

Ruixiang Li

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-3, drawn to an isolated nucleic acid, an expression vector, and host cells, classified in class 536, subclass 23.5, and class 435, subclass 320.1 and 325.
- II. Claims 4-6 and 25, drawn to polypeptides, fusion proteins, a pharmaceutical composition comprising a polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350, and class 514, subclass 2.
- III. Claim 7, drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.9.
- IV. Claims 8-17, drawn to a method of screening for candidate compounds capable of modulating activity of a G-protein coupled receptor-encoding polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclasses, 6 and 7.1.
- V. Claims 18-22 (in part), drawn to a method of treating a neurological disorder comprising administration of the pharmaceutical composition comprising a small molecule, classified in class 514, subclass 1.
- VI. Claims 18-22 (in part), drawn to a method of treating a neurological disorder comprising administration of the pharmaceutical composition comprising a peptide, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
- VII. Claims 18-22 (in part), drawn to a method of treating a neurological disorder comprising administration of the pharmaceutical composition comprising an antisense, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
- VIII. Claims 23 and 24, drawn to an antisense, classified in class 536, subclass 24.5.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other for the following reasons. Inventions I-III and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP §806.04, MPEP §808.01). In the instant case, the different inventions are drawn to completely different products, nucleic acid molecules, polypeptides, antibodies, and antisenses. These molecules have completely different structures and biological functions which are not interchangeable and which require non-cohesive searches and considerations.
3. Inventions IV-VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP §806.04, MPEP §808.01). In the instance case, the different inventions are drawn to completely different methods each having completely different method steps, using different compositions, and having completely different outcomes. Each method is unique and not required for another. Thus, the methods are exclusive and require non-cohesive searches and considerations.
4. Invention I is related to Invention IV as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05 (h)). In the instant case, the nucleic acids may be used in a materially different process such as production of a polypeptide.

Art Unit: 1646

5. Invention II is related to Invention IV and VI as product and process of use. The invention can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05 (h)). In the instant case, the polypeptide may be used in a materially different process such as to immunize mice to produce an antibody.
6. Invention VIII is related to Invention VII as product and process of use. The invention can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05 (h)). In the instant case, the antisense may be used in a materially different process such as primers or probes.
7. Invention I is an independent invention from Inventions V-VII; Invention II is an independent invention from Inventions V and VII; Invention III is an independent invention from Inventions IV-VII; Invention VIII is an independent invention from Inventions IV-VI. The different inventions are drawn to distinct product and method inventions.
8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1646

9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for a single group is not required for any other group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
10. Furthermore, the application contains claims which are directed to polypeptides of SEQ ID NO: 2 and SEQ ID NO: 49, or nucleic acids that encode the polypeptides. Each sequence represents a structural and functionally distinct entity that is capable of supporting a separate patent. The search and consideration of more than a single sequence constitutes an undue search burden on the office, given the ever-increasing size of the database.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of a single polypeptide or nucleic acid that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election. **The Examiner notes that this is not a species election requirement; rather it sets forth additional invention groups.**

11. This application contains claims directed to the numerous patentably distinct species of neurological disorders as listed in claim 20. These disorders have distinct pathologic conditions and require non-cohesive searches and considerations. Accordingly, the restriction is proper.

Should applicant elect an invention group that contains these claims, Applicant is also required to elect a single species of disease for prosecution on the merits to

Art Unit: 1646

which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is further required to indicate that whether the elected disorder is an anxiolytic disorder (claim 21) and is associated with aberrant expression or activity of p21, p27, and IκB.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02 (a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

12. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found

Art Unit: 1646

allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply



Art Unit: 1646

where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues.

See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48 (b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48 (b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17 (I).

#### ***Advisory Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruixiang Li whose telephone number is (571) 272-0875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa, can be reached on (571) 272-0829. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 1646

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at the toll-free phone number 866-217-9197.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ruixiang Li".

Ruixiang Li, Ph.D.

Examiner

August 8, 2005